

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/676,380	09/29/2000	Andre T. Baron	99-057	1919
7590 03/11/2004		EXAMINER		
Debra M. Parrish			ANDRES, JANET L	
Attorney at Law Suite 200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
615 Washington Road			1646	
Pittsburgh, PA 15228			DATE MAILED: 03/11/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/676,380	BARON ET AL.			
navious notion	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Janet L. Andres	1646			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 28 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the contract of the con	ation. A proper reply to a			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP			
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	f extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply one to later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mater	rially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s): See Continuation Sheet.				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) <u>18-23</u> would be canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		parate, timely filed amendment			
The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .					
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.					
For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed: <u>1-8</u> .					
Claim(s) objected to: 18-23.					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>9-17</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ appr	oved or b)⊡ disapproved by th	e Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	t(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	· 1			
10. Other:	TA TA	MANEY ANDRES			

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Applicant's amendment is sufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 9-23 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues with respect to the rejection of claims 9-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that the prior comments show that the references cited by the Examiner do not teach or render obvious the present invention, and that the Baron paper was cited to enable the Examiner to appreciate the differences more correctly. For the reasons set forth in the office action of 29 July 2003 and 14 May 2003, Applicant's arguments are not found to be persuasive. The antibodies used were known in the art and the development of antibody assays is routine. Baron does not provide evidence that the method developed by Applicant is superior because the comparison is not to that which the Examiner has cited as the prior art, and because, according to Applicant's arguments, the assay of Baron is not the claimed assay.